arXiv:1607.00660v1 [math.MG] 3 Jul 2016

Minimal tilings of a unit square

Iwan Praton
Franklin & Marshall College
Lancaster, PA 17604

Abstract

Tile the unit square with n small squares. We determine the minimum of the sum of the side lengths of the n small squares, where the minimum is taken over all tilings of the unit square with n squares.

There are many interesting questions that arise from placing non-overlapping small squares inside a larger square. For example, if we require the small squares to have different side lengths and to tile the large square, then we have the classic "squaring the square" problem, popularized in Martin Gardner's column (November 1958). The website `squaring.net` contains a trove of information about similar problems.

Erdős and Soifer introduced a different kind of question in this situation: if we put n non-overlapping small squares inside the unit square, how big can the side lengths of small squares get? They defined a function $f_M(n)$ (essentially the largest possible sum of the side lengths of the n small squares) and gave a precise conjecture of its value. Erdős also offered a \$50 bounty for its proof or disproof. There has been some progress on this question —see [2], [3], [4]—but the conjecture is still unsolved.

In this paper we look at the natural analogue f_m of the function f_M, where we investigate the minimum instead of the maximum. More precisely, and to fix our terminology and notation, let $n \neq 1, 2, 3, 5$ be a positive integer and let T be a *tiling* of the unit square using n small squares (thus the n small squares are placed inside the unit square, completely filling it, and with their interiors non-overlapping). The small squares are called tiles. Note that it

is not possible to tile the unit squares with $2, 3$, or 5 tiles; we also exclude $n = 1$ to avoid triviality. We define $\sigma(T)$ to be the total length of the tiling T: if $s_1, \ldots, s_n$ are the side lengths of the tiles, then $\sigma(T) = s_1 + \cdots + s_n$. We want to find out just how *small* $\sigma(T)$ can be; in order to make this question interesting, we'll insist that each tile has positive length, so that $s_i > 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Define the function $f_m(n) = \min_T \sigma(T)$, where the minimum is taken over all possible tilings of the unit square using n tiles. The aim of this paper is to prove the following formula: for $k \geq 2$,

$$f_m(n) = \begin{cases} 3 - \frac{2}{k} & \text{if } n = 2k; \\ 3 - \frac{1}{k} & \text{if } n = 2k + 3. \end{cases}$$

These values can be attained: if $n = 2k$, tile the unit square with one big tile of length $(k-1)/k$ and $2k - 1$ small tiles of length $1/k$ (there is essentially only one way to do this). If $n = 2k + 3$, we start with the minimal tiling for $2k$, then divide one of the tiles of length $1/k$ into 4 equal tiles. The figures below show the cases $n = 8$ and $n = 11$ (i.e., $k = 4$).



(It turns out there is another minimal tiling in the odd case. Start with three tiles of side length $1/2$; then tile the remaining $1/2 \times 1/2$ empty space with $2k$ tiles in the best (minimal) way.)

To start the proof, we introduce coordinates. Put the unit square so that its corners are at $(0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 0)$, and $(1, 1)$. For a given tiling T, recall from [4] the Staton-Tyler function f, where $f(c)$ is the number of tiles that intersect the vertical line $x = c$ $(0 \leq c \leq 1)$. Staton and Tyler showed that $\sigma(T) = \int_0^1 f(x)\, dx$. Note that the definition of f includes an ambiguity when the line $x = c$ intersects a vertical edge of a tile in T, but the ambiguity is not harmful since we only use f inside an integral.

Lemmas 1 to 4 below have appeared in [3] under a different context.

Lemma 1. *Suppose T is a minimal tiling. Then there exist two tiles whose lengths add up to* 1.

Proof. If not, then $f(x) \geq 3$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$. Thus $\sigma(T) = \int_0^1 f(x)\, dx \geq 3$, a contradiction. □

Let's say that T is minimal and A and B are two tiles with $s_A + s_B = 1$.
Lemma 2. *One (or both) of A and B must lie at a corner.*

Proof. Again by contradiction.

If neither A nor B lie at a corner, then the tiling looks like the figure on the right. The tiles on the left edge of the unit square, together with the tiles on the right edge of the unit square, have total length 2. Note that neither A nor B are included in this count. Thus the total length of the tiling is at least 3, meaning T is not minimal.



□

We can actually conclude more than this. We can assume without loss of generality that both A and B are corner tiles, as in the following lemma.
Lemma 3. *Suppose A is a corner tile and B is not. Then there exists a similar tiling, with exactly the same total length, where B is a corner tile.*

Proof. The proof is by picture:



□

We can thus assume that in our minimal tiling, one vertical side of the unit square has just two tiles, A and B. We choose their names so that $s_A \geq s_B$.

Lemma 4. *Let A and B be corner tiles as above, with $s_A \geq s_B$. Then we can assume without harm that there is another tile with length s_B in the opposite corner from B.*

Proof. Turn the tiling with A and B by 90 degrees, then apply the same reasoning as before, especially lemmas 1 and 3. We get the conclusion. □

We now have quite a bit of information about the minimal tiling T. There is a large tile A at one corner of the unit square, and on each adjacent corner there is a tile of size $s_B = 1 - s_A$. Note that this implies $s_A \geq 1/2$, so A is the largest tile in T.



We now concentrate on this tile A. It may be the largest tile in the tiling, but it can't be *too* large.

Lemma 5. *Suppose T is a tiling with $2k$ tiles. Let A denote the largest tile in T, as above. Then $s_A \leq (k-1)/k$.*

Proof. Every tile except A has length at most $1 - s_A$. Therefore the total area of all tiles is at most $(2k-1)(1-s_A)^2 + s_A^2 = 2ks_A^2 - (4k-2)s_A + (2k-1)$. It is straightforward to verify that this quadratic in s_A is smaller than 1 whenever $(k-1)/k < s_A < 1$. Thus we can only achieve a tiling when $s_A \leq (k-1)/k$. □

It would be nice to have a similar result when the number of tiles in T is odd, but the calculation is not as straightforward. We begin with a careful consideration of the placement of the tiles.

Lemma 6. *For $n \geq 2$, suppose $1/(k+1) < b < 1/k$ and T is a tiling with a large corner tile A of length $s_A = 1 - b$. Then $\sigma(T) \geq 3 - b$.*

Proof. As usual we put the unit square so it has corners at $(0,0)$ and $(1,0)$. Place the tile A so that it has a corner at $(1,0)$. All tiles other than A have length at most b.

We now take a look at the top edge of the unit square. There are at most k tiles of length b on this top edge (since $(k+1)b > 1$). Suppose there are indeed k tiles of length b on this top edge. As in Lemma 3 we can assume

that these tiles are all on the right side, with no gaps between them. Since $kb > 1 - b$, we have a situation pictured on the left.



If we now flip the tiling around the main diagonal of the unit square, we get an equivalent tiling where there are at most $(k-1)$ tiles of length b on the top edge. Thus we can harmlessly assume that the top edge of the unit square has at most $(k-1)$ tiles of length b. These tiles can further be assumed to be on the right side, with no gaps between them, so they all lie on the interval $(b, 1)$.

Now recall the Staton-Tyler function f. If $0 < x < b$, then $f(x) \geq k+1$ since k tiles, each of length at most b, cannot add up to 1. Now suppose there are m tiles of length b in the interval $b < x < 1$; these tiles necessarily lie on top of tile A. As noted above, we have $m \leq k - 1$. Note that in this interval, we have $f(x) = 2$ whenever we have a tile of size b, and $f(x) \geq 3$ otherwise. The m tiles of size b have total length mb, so we have $f(x) \geq 3$ in an interval of length $1 - b - mb$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(T) = \int_0^1 f(x)\,dx &= \int_0^b f(x)\,dx + \int_b^1 f(x)\,dx \\ &\geq (k+1)b + 2mb + 3(1 - b - mb) = 3 + (k - 2 - m)b \\ &\geq 3 - b \quad \text{since } m \leq k - 1;\end{aligned}$$

this is exactly what we want. □

We can now get a result similar to Lemma 5 for odd tilings.

Lemma 7. *Suppose T is a minimal tiling with $2k+3$ tiles. As before, let A denote the largest tile in T. Then $s_A \leq (k-1)/k$.*

Proof. Suppose first that $(k-1)/k < s_A < k/(k+1)$. Then $b = 1 - s_A$ satisfies $1/k > b > 1/(k+1)$. By the previous lemma, we have $\sigma(T) \geq 3 - b > 3 - 1/k$, so T is not minimal. We can similarly rule out the case that $k/(k+1) < s_A < (k+1)/(k+2)$. If $s_A \geq (k+1)/(k+2)$, then we need at

least $2(k+1)+1+1 = 2k+4$ tiles to tile the unit square, which is too many. Thus we are reduced to the case that $a = k/(k+1)$.

In this case, we redo the calculation that we did in the $3-b$ lemma. The integral is exactly the same as before: if there are m tiles ($0 \le m \le k-1$) of size $b = 1/(k+1)$ on the top of the unit square, then $\sigma(T) \ge 3 - b = 3 - 1/(k+1) > 3 - 1/k$, which means T is not minimal. Thus there must be at least k tiles on top of the unit square. Similarly there are k tiles on the left side of of the unit square. This accounts for $2k+1$ tiles; the empty space at the upper left corner is a b-by-b square, which cannot be tiled with just two tiles. Thus this case also leads to T being not minimal. □

Of particular interest is the case $k = 2$. In this case we conclude that s_A is at most $1/2$, but we know that $s_A \ge 1/2$. Thus $s_A = 1/2$. By Lemma 4, we conclude that T has 3 tiles of length $1/2$. The remaining $1/2 \times 1/2$ space must be tiled with four tiles, and there is only one way to do that. So the length of the tiling is $5/2$, i.e., $f_m(7) = 5/2$.

We are now ready to prove our main result.

Theorem 8. *For $k \ge 2$,*

$$f_m(n) = \begin{cases} 3 - \frac{2}{k} & \text{if } n = 2k, \\ 3 - \frac{1}{k} & \text{if } n = 2k+3. \end{cases}$$

Proof. The proof is by induction on k. If $k = 2$, in the even case we have $n = 4$, where the result is clear; in the odd case we have $n = 7$, which we have already proved. So assume that $k > 2$.

From Lemma 4 we know that it does no harm to assume that our minimal tiling has a big tile A located at a corner. For ease of reading write a for the length s_A of tile A. We can also assume that there are tiles of length $1-a$ adjacent to A.

Suppose first that T contains $2k$ tiles. Suppose further that $a > 1/2$. Notice that there is a tiling of the upper left $a \times a$ subsquare. In the picture this subsquare is indicated by the dashed line.



The number of tiles in this tiling of the subsquare is $2k - 2 = 2(k-1)$. Applying the induction hypothesis, the total length of this tiling is at least

$a(3-2/(k-1))$. Therefore the total length of the original tiling of the unit square is at least

$$a\left(3-\frac{2}{k-1}\right)+2(1-a)+a-[a-(1-a)]=3-\frac{2a}{k-1}.$$

By Lemma 5 $a \leq (k-1)/k$, so

$$3-\frac{2a}{k-1} \geq 3-\frac{2(k-1)/k}{k-1}=3-\frac{2}{k},$$

as required.

There is also the pesky possibility that $a = 1/2$. In this case the unit square is divided into four subsquares, where the upper left $1/2 \times 1/2$ subsquare is further tiled into $2k-3 = 2(k-3)+3$ tiles. This might not be possible—indeed, if $k = 3, 4$, then this subsquare cannot be tiled with 3 or 5 tiles. In such cases we are finished. So we can assume that $k \geq 5$. By the induction hypothesis, the total length of this subtiling is at least $(1/2)(3-1/(k-3)) = 3/2 - 1/(2k-6)$. Thus the total length of the tiling of the unit square is $3/2 - 1/(2k-6) + 3/2 = 3 - 1/(2k-6)$. This is bigger than $3-2/k$ for $k \geq 5$, and we are done.

We now have to deal with the case where T has $2k+3$ tiles. As before, we first consider the case where there is a big tile of size $a > 1/2$; the picture is as above. The dashed subsquare is tiled with $2k+1$ tiles. By the induction hypothesis, the length of the tiling is at least $a(3-1/(k-1)) = 3a-a/(k-1)$. Thus the total length of the tiling of the unit square is at least

$$3a-\frac{a}{n-1}+2(1-a)+a-[a-(1-a)]=3-\frac{a}{k-1}.$$

We know from Lemma 7 that $a \leq (k-1)/k$, so

$$3-\frac{a}{k-1} \geq 3-\frac{(k-1)/k}{k-1}=3-\frac{1}{k},$$

as required.

We also need to consider the case where $a = 1/2$. In this case, the unit square is divided into four $1/2 \times 1/2$ subsquares, and one of these subsquares is tiled into $2k$ tiles. We already showed above that the length of this tiling is at least $(1/2)(3-2/k) = 3/2 - 1/k$, so the total length of the tiling of the unit square is at least $3/2 - 1/k + 3/2 = 3 - 1/k$, which is what we require.

□

References

[1] P. Erdős and A. Soifer, Squares in a Square. Geombinatorics, **IV**, no. 4 (1995), 110–114.

[2] I. Praton, Packing Squares in a Square, Mathematics Magazine **81** (2008), 358–361.

[3] I. Praton, Tiling a unit square with 8 squares, Geombinatorics, **XXII** no. 3 (2012), 109–115.

[4] W. Staton and B. Tyler, On the Erdős Square-Packing Conjecture. Geombinatorics, **XVII**, no. 2 (2007), 88–94.